

August 18, 2003

Page 41

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 33 were pending in the original application. In an Office Action dated May 7, 2003 (the "Office Action"), the Examiner: (i) rejected Claim 1-22, 24-31 and 33 under 35 U.S. §102(a) as being anticipated by the article entitled "Speeding Up Secret Computations with Insecure Auxiliary Devices" by Matsumoto et al. (the "Matsumoto reference"); (ii) rejected Claims 1-2, 13-14, 18, 20, 24-25 and 28-29 under 35 U.S. §102(a) as being anticipated by the article entitled "Fast Server-Aided Secret Computation Protocols for Modular Exponentiation" by Kawamura et al. (the "Kawamura reference"); (iii) rejected Claims 1-2, 13-14, 18, 20, 24-25 and 28-29 under 35 U.S. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the article entitled "Netsolve: A Network for Solving Computational Science Problems" by Casanova et al. (the "Casanova reference"), and further in view of the article entitled "On Hiding Information from an Oracle" by Abadi et al. (the "Abadi reference"); and (iv) objected to Claims 23 and 33 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that Claims 23 and 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants herein respectfully: (a) amend the equation appearing at line 8 on page 54 of Applicants' specification to correct a typographical error; (b) cancel Claims 3, 13-17, and 24-27; (c) amend Claims 1, 4-5, 7-12, 18-19, 28, and 30; (d) traverse the rejections of Claims 2, 6, 20-23, 29, and 31-33; and (e) submit new Claims 34-82. Claims 1-2, 4-12, 18-23, and 28-82 remain in the application following these amendments.

Ample support may be found throughout Applicants' specification for the amendments to Claims 1, 4-5, 7-12, 18-19, 28, and 30. No new matter has been added by the amendments made to these claims. Likewise, ample support may be found throughout Applicants' specification for the new Claims 34-82. No new matter has been added by these new claims.

I. Amended Independent Claims 1, 18, and 28 Should be Allowed.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 18, and 28 as being anticipated by each of the Matsumoto reference and the Kawamura reference. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every [limitation] as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 18, and 28, as amended, include at least one claim limitation that is not found in either the Matsumoto reference or the Kawamura reference.

Amended Claim 1 includes the limitation "classifying, with a first computer, the outsourced computation into one of a number of computation types." It is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not described in the Matsumoto reference. It also is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not described in the Kawamura reference.

Amended Claim 18 includes the limitation "said computer being programmed to classify said computation into at least one of a plurality of computation types." It is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not described in the Matsumoto reference. It also is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not described in the Kawamura reference.

Amended Claim 28 includes the limitation "said programming instructions being operable to classify said computation into at least one of a plurality of computation types." It is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not described in the Matsumoto reference. It also is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not described in the Kawamura reference.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 18, and 28, as amended, are patentable over both the Matsumoto reference and the Kawamura reference.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1, 18, and 28 as being unpatentable over the Casanova reference in view of the Abadi reference. "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP § 2143.03 (citing In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974)). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 18, and 28, as amended, include at least one claim limitation that is not taught or suggested by the Casanova reference in view of the Abadi reference.

Amended Claim 1 includes the limitation "classifying, with a first computer, the outsourced computation into one of a number of computation types." It is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the Casanova reference in view of the Abadi reference.

Amended Claim 18 includes the limitation "said computer being programmed to classify said computation into at least one of a plurality of computation types." It is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the Casanova reference in view of the Abadi reference.

Amended Claim 28 includes the limitation "said programming instructions being operable to classify said computation into at least one of a plurality of computation types." It is respectfully submitted that this limitation is not taught or suggested by the Casanova reference in view of the Abadi reference.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 18, and 28, as amended, are patentable over the Casanova reference in view of the Abadi reference.

II. Amended Dependent Claims 4-5, 7-12, 19, and 30 Should be Allowed.

Claims 4-5 and 7-12 each depend from Claim 1. Claim 19 depends from Claim 18. Claim 30 depends from Claim 28. For the reasons cited above in the discussion of Claims 1, 18, and 28, it is respectfully submitted that such claims, as amended, are patentable. Because the independent Claims 1, 18, and 28 are patentable, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 4-5, 7-12, 19, and 30 also are patentable.

III. Dependent Claims 2, 6, 20-23, 29, and 31-33 Should be Allowed.

Claims 2 and 6 each depend from Claim 1. Claims 20-23 depend from Claim 18. Claims 29 and 31-33 depend from Claim 28. For the reasons cited above in the discussion of Claims 1, 18, and 28, it is respectfully submitted that such claims, as amended, are patentable. Because the independent Claims 1, 18, and 28 are patentable, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2, 6, 20-23, 29, and 31-33 also are patentable.

August 18, 2003

Page 45

IV. New Claims 34-82 Should be Allowed.

Ample support may be found throughout Applicants' specification for the new Claims 34-82. No new matter has been added by new Claims 34-82.

The Examiner's attention is directed to new Claims 34-35. In the Office Action the Examiner objected to Claims 23 and 33 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 23 and 33 remain in the application unamended, but because in each case the relevant base claim (Claim 18 and Claim 28, respectively) has been amended, the scope of Claims 23 and 33 has changed. New Claim 34 reflects the original Claim 23 rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the original base claim (original claim 18). New Claim 35 reflects the original Claim 33 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the original base claim (original claim 28).

August 18, 2003
Page 46

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that Applicants have made a patentable contribution to the art and that this amendment places the above identified application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative this amendment places the application in a better form for appeal. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner continue to find any of the claims objectionable for any reason, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned for a telephone interview before taking further action.

Very truly yours,

ICE MILLER



Thomas A. Walsh
Attorney No. 45,196
ICE MILLER
One American Square, Box 82001
Indianapolis, Indiana 46282-0002
Telephone: (317) 236-5946
Facsimile: (317) 236-2219

TAW:jj
Enclosure: Check for \$210.00
Return Postcard
cc: Karen White
Eric Davis